DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 399 954 IR 056 070

AUTHOR	Haycock, Ken
TITLE	Research in Teacher-Librarianship and the Institutionalization of Change.
PUB DATE	Feb 95
NOTE	11p.; In: Literacy: Traditional, Cultural, Technological. Selected Papers from the Annual Conference of the International Association of School Librarianship (23rd, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, July 17-22, 1994); see IR 056 058.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Change Strategies; Communication (Thought Transfer); Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Librarian Teacher Cooperation; *Library Development; *Library Services; Program Development; Public Libraries; Qualifications; Research; *School Libraries; Staff Development
IDENTIFIERS	*Teacher Librarians

ABSTRACT

This review focuses on characteristics of effective school library programs which significantly affect student achievement and which have the support of educational decision-makers. In schools with good resource centers and the services of a teacher-librarian, students perform significantly better on tests for basic research skills. The evidence is similarly clear that more reading is done where there is a school library and a teacher-librarian. School resource centers with full-time teacher-librarians even contribute to the development of positive self-concepts. The role of the teacher-librarian requires clarification if there is to be any improvement in existing programs. Teacher-librarians must have teaching qualifications and classroom experience prior to further education and training. The development of student competence is most effective when integrated with classroom instruction through cooperative program planning and team teaching by two equal partners--the classroom teacher and the teacher-librarian--yet communication is often lacking. There is also evidence that there are benefits to students when school and public libraries cooperate, yet public librarians and school librarians communicate very little. The research literature provides considerable evidence and guidance as to what constitutes effectiveness in the implementation of any desired change. A district policy to guide and support implementation and a district plan for a structured process can prove helpful. The implementation of change requires persistent advocacy and continual leadership and school support. With successful programs in place, teacher librarians can then assume more responsibility for writing about their role and about collaboratively planned programs for professional journals read by teachers and administrators. (Contains 88 references.) (AEF)

ED 399 954

Research in Teacher-Librarianship and the Institutionalization of Change

by
Ken Haycock, Professor and Director
School of Library Archival and Information Studies
The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, BC Canada

One often hears the refrain that there is no research in teacher-librarianship, no proof of effect on student achievement, no concrete evidence of value for money: if only there was some strong justification for school libraries and school librarians, there would be no need to advocate and lobby for adequate staff, collections and facilities. However, there is a strong research base for teacher-librarianship, there is evidence of effect on student achievement and there is ample justification for the presence and effective use of teacher-librarians and school library resource centers. Why then are there ongoing problems of support?

First, the research is not as well known to the profession as it should be and researchers and practitioners alike criticize when it took place, where it took place and with whom it took place. If we accepted our own research and built on it we would progress far beyond the generalization of a single experience and the intuition alone of the principal, teacher and teacher-librarian. Nothing is ever certain in a complex world but research which is reliable, valid and replicated has value and worth.

Second, even with what we do know about effective school library programs and services, we find it difficult to put them in place. Principals and teachers can be convinced of the value of the teacher-librarian and school resource center and hold an image of the appropriate and effective role of the principal, teacher and teacher-librarian as partners in the educational enterprise but the implementation still does not occur, and does not reach a stage of institutionalization, of becoming an integral, essential part of the fabric of the school. In this case the research in curriculum implementation and staff development can provide guidance for the successful initiation, implementation and institutionalization of school library programs.

The terms teacher-librarian and resource center are used here as these are common in many parts of the world. A teacher-librarian is a qualified teacher with successful classroom teaching experience and additional post-baccalaureate education in teacher-librarianship. The teacher-librarian performs a unified role, uniquely combining teacher and librarian, and may work full-time or part-time in the school resource center. The term resource center is similarly used for consistency; the resource center houses the school's collection of curriculum resources, including information books and other media and imaginative liter-ature; these are coherently and consistently or-ganized for physical access and the teacher-librarian plans with classroom teachers to develop and implement programs which assure intellectual access by increasingly independent student learners.

Research in Teacher-librarianship

The research in teacher-librarianship is rich and diverse and recent publications provide useful guides to the research and scholarly literature (see Haycock, 1990; Krashen, 1993; Lance et al., 1993). This review is delimited to the characteristics of effective programs which affect student achievement in a significant way and which have the support of educational decision-makers like school principals and superintendents. It therefore does not include factors related to the selection and management of resources, to facilities or to general school and classroom practice.

There is a positive relationship between the level of resource center service available and student scholastic achievement. In schools with good resource centers and the services of a teacher-librarian (TL), students perform significantly better on tests for basic research skills, including locational skills, outlining and note-taking, and the knowledge and use of reference materials, including the use of a dictionary and an encyclopedia (Becker, 1970; Callison, 1979; Greve, 1974; McMillen, 1965; Nolan, 1989; Yarling, 1968); they also perform significantly better in the area of reading comprehension and in their ability to express ideas effectively concerning their readings (Yarling, 1968). Indeed, among school and community predictors of academic achievement, the size of the resource center staff and collection is second only to the absence of at-risk conditions, particularly pov-

IR056070

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ken Haycock
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

erty and low educational attainment among adults (Lance, Welborn & Hamilton-Pennell, 1993), and of four other factors that predict student achievement—school resource center collection size; school resource center expenditure; public library collection size; public library expenditure—the greatest predictor is school resource center collection size (Greve, 1974).

The evidence is similarly clear that more reading is done where there is a school library and a teacher-librarian; children also read more where they live close to a public library (Krashen, 1993). Students in schools with centralized resource centers and teacher-librarians not only read more, they enjoy reading more (Lowe, 1984). A print-rich environment, including larger library collections, and a good reading environment, including comfort and quiet, affect reading, literacy development and reading scores (Krashen, 1993). Further, providing time for free voluntary reading in schools has a positive impact on reading comprehension, vocabulary development, spelling, written style, oral/aural language and control of grammar (Krashen, 1993).

School resource centers with full-time teacher-librarians even contribute to the development of positive self-concepts (McAfee, 1981).

Why are these gains not realized in all situations and circumstances? First, the role of the teacher-librarian requires clarification if there is to be any improvement in existing resource center programs (Charter, 1982). Principals, teachers and teacher-librarians themselves have many misconceptions about the role of the TL in the instructional program (Bias, 1979; Burcham, 1989; Hambleton, 1980; Hodson, 1978; Jones, 1977; Kerr, 1973; Kim, 1981; Olson, 1966) such that school districts need to provide a clearer definition of the role of the TL (Markle, 1982). TLs need to take an active part in defining their role, particularly in cooperative program planning and teaching and need to communicate their role more effectively to principals and teachers, through in-service programs and through an emphasis on work with people more than management and production processes (Bechtel, 1975; Bias, 1979; Pichette, 1975; Sullivan, 1979). In fact, TLs who place a higher priority on personal relations offer more services to teachers and students; TLs who rate personal relations as a lower priority spend more time on circulation and related tasks (Adams, 1973).

Teacher-librarians require teaching qualifications and classroom experience prior to further education and training as a TL in order to be effective. Prior successful teaching experience is necessary for TLs to perceive and solve instructional problems (Van Dreser, 1971). Exemplary teacher-librarians, as identified in the professional literature and by exemplary principals, display the traits of exemplary teachers—as well, they plan with teachers, use flexible and innovative teaching and public relations approaches, teach well, provide continuous access, design flexible policies, and develop collections which support the curriculum (Alexander, 1992). More years of classroom teaching experience and more preparation in curriculum development and implementation are needed than is currently the case (Corr, 1979). Superintendents, principals and teachers consistently point to the need for teacher-librarians to have more classroom teaching experience if programs are to develop in a credible and successful way (Wilson, 1972).

The development of student competence is most effective when integrated with classroom instruction through cooperative program planning and team teaching by two equal teaching partners—the classroom teacher and the teacher-librarian (Callison, 1979). Minimal gains in research and study skills can be achieved through instruction by the classroom teacher or the teacher-librarian alone (Nolan, 1989). Effective instruction depends on the cooperative effort of both teacher and TL; stated another way, scheduled library skills classes taught solely by the TL are not as effective as integrated, cooperatively planned and taught programs (Smith, 1978). Indeed, not only do flexibly scheduled resource centers provide greater academic benefits, but students themselves believe that the resource center is more useful in their school work than students in scheduled schools (Hodson, 1978; Nolan, 1989). When flexibly scheduled, the TL and resource center can have a significant effect on student achievement in information handling and use and in content areas. Indeed, the most significant changes in library programs occur when the teacher-librarian moves to flexible scheduling and curriculum-integrated instruction; positive cooperative relations with teachers, administrators and students contribute to this success (Bishop, 1992).

It is difficult to imagine why teacher-librarians are not involved in cooperative program planning and team teaching with classroom colleagues as equal teaching partners to the extent that principals, teachers and teacher-

librarians themselves believe that they should be (Corr, 1979; Johnson, 1975; Kerr, 1975; Stanwich, 1982). If the teacher uses the resource center and consults with the TL about planning student work, then the use of the resource center is greater (Hartley, 1980). In fact, students rate schools more highly when there is agreement and communication among principals, teachers and TLs regarding program objectives, and where there is planned, consistent and integrated instruction in resource center use (Scott, 1982). Important factors which affect TL involvement in curricular issues include the principal's attitude towards the TL's role, teacher preference for TLs with successful teaching experience and a teacher's frame of reference, the number of support staff, and degree of teacher understanding of the role of the TL and the potential of the resource center (Corr, 1979). Perhaps most importantly, teacher-librarians require extensive training in cooperative program planning and teaching which builds on prior successful classroom teaching experience. Programs which educate teacher-librarians would do well to structure programs around cooperative program planning and teaching and the skills necessary to convince educators that TLs are vital partners in instruction (Royal, 1981). These competencies, however, tend not to be supervised in practica to the extent that other competencies are.

Cooperative program planning and teaching as an instructional development activity requires more social interaction with other teachers than is required of other roles of the TL yet there is a low level of communication between teachers and TLs (Urbanik, 1984). Teacher-librarians may also need education and training in social interaction skills. Teacher-librarians in exemplary resource centers are extroverted and independent: as leaders they have "tough poise" (Charter, 1982). Teacher-librarians who are less cautious and more extroverted than their colleagues tend to be more successful; the best pair of predictors of high circulation of materials in the resource center is high extroversion and a high degree of curriculum involvement by the TL (Madaus, 1974).

Since principals, teachers and teacher-librarians all agree on the importance of cooperative program planning and teaching, all three should be involved in resolving issues mitigating against substantial involvement. TLs need to organize more inservice training for colleagues (Callison, 1979; Hartley, 1980) and educators of TLs need to revise programs to include courses which foster cooperation and understanding between teachers and TLs (Royal, 1981).

There is also evidence that there are benefits to students when school and public libraries cooperate yet public librarians and teacher-librarians communicate very little with each other (Woolls, 1973) even though students who use school resource centers are more likely to have positive attitudes toward public libraries and to use those libraries (Ekechukwu, 1972). While duplication of services between school and public libraries may be lamented, it will not be rectified by administrators or practitioners in either institution: practitioners even question the motives behind overt suggestions for cooperation—self-preservation and protection of territory override the ideal of cooperation (Dyer, 1976). Adequate funding, staffing and "personality" most positively affect cooperation, while funding, staffing, governance at the state level and work schedules most adversely affect cooperation (Kelley, 1992).

Institutionalization of Change

The research literature provides considerable evidence and guidance as to what constitutes effectiveness in the implementation of any desired change (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). While this overview cannot do justice to the extent of research in this field sufficient conclusions can be drawn which can impact on the effective implementation of cooperative program planning and teaching, and flexible scheduling, across a school district.

The content of effective staff development is research-based (Cawelti, 1989; Griffin, 1987; Howey & Vaughan, 1983), proven effective (Hunter, 1986), practical (Guskey, 1986; Hunter, 1986; Nevi, 1986), and relevant to identified needs and problems faced in the classroom (Daresh, 1987; Elam et al., 1986; Howey & Vaughan, 1983; Orlich, 1989; Paquette, 1987; Rubin, 1987); these are all evident in the effective use of the teacher-librarian through cooperative program planning and teaching and flexible scheduling. Successful implementation requires that this new program have clear goals (Cato, 1990), that the nature of the change be explicit and realistic (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989b; Pratt, 1980) and pay particular attention to the contexts, the schools and classrooms, in which teachers work (Griffin, 1987).

An effective implementation plan is

based on an understanding of the developmental aspects of change (Fullan, 1985; Fullan et al., 1986), sets clear expectations and manageable objectives (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988), incorporates realistic time lines (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989a; Dow et al., 1984; Loucks & Lieberman, 1983; Pratt, 1980), allocation of resources and monitoring and feedback procedures (Fullan & Park, 1981), and incorporates the professional development of consultants, principals and resource teachers as well as classroom teachers (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1982; British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989b; Fullan et al., 1986). In other words, change is a process, not an event like one workshop, and requires the understanding of all "stakeholders".

A district policy to guide and support implementation and a district plan for a structured implementation process will prove helpful (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989b; Dow et al., 1984; Fullan & Park, 1981; Lee & Wong, 1985; Mooradian, 1985; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988). Priorities will need to be established among competing demands if a district is facing several curricula changes at once (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989b; Dow et al., 1984); too often a district library media coordinator will lead a change effort in school library programs while other district and school administrators are leading changes in other areas which are competing for the same time, attention and resources—the response of the school is, understandably, to set its own priorities or to ignore them all.

The importance of the new approach, expectations for its use (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1982; Fullan & Park, 1981; Loucks & Lieberman, 1983), and implementation plans should be communicated widely throughout the system (Lee & Wong, 1985; Romberg & Price, 1983). Significant changes in behavior, roles and responsibilities expected of teachers need to be described in detail, clarifying both the similarities and differences with what they are already doing (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1982; Fullan et al., 1986), and teachers need the opportunity to discuss the implications and adaptation with colleagues (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989b). Effective change procedures also require some pressure to change (Fullan, 1990) as well as a support system (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989a); this is often done by working with a school staff rather than through cross-district workshops in order to encourage both peer pressure and peer support to change.

Teacher-librarians and their advocates will need to work more effectively with senior education staff. School superintendents support the need for professional teacher-librarians and generally understand the potential impact of a teacher-librarian but they nevertheless often set other priorities (Lowden, 1980). Many superintendents believe that a teacher-librarian is an absolute necessity and few would staff a resource center with only an aide, but a sizable minority still see the TL as a luxury (Connors, 1984). While sometimes skeptical about the TL's and resource center's influence on teaching in the school, superintendents nevertheless believe that teachers would notice if the resource center was closed and teachers would have to teach differently (Connors, 1984). Superintendents also believe that the teaching background and experience of the TL may be too limited to support a significant impact on the school (Connors, 1984). Clearly, TLs and their superintendents need to communicate more often and more effectively if successful implementation is to take place (Payne, 1967).

Implementation requires the involvement and support of the right people and groups within the district at the right time; both educational and political criteria should be used to select a district planning committee to ensure the quality of the plan and its acceptability (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989b). One goal is the creation of a well-informed group of teachers with a clear sense of mission and the confidence that can bring about change (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988); an internal advocacy group improves the chances for change by putting pressure on the people and the organization (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988).

The implementation of change requires persistent advocacy and continual leadership and school support (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989b). Program leaders, like district coordinators, need to anticipate initial resistance to change, need to deal with how people feel about change, need to deal with conflicts, need to know what can be done to lessen anxiety and need to know how to facilitate the change process (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988). The school library media coordinator can have a positive effect on school resource center program development in the school district (Coleman, 1982); even the existence of a coordinator seems to result in significantly higher implementation of guiding

principles for personnel, budget, purchasing, production, access and delivery systems, program evaluation, collections and facilities (Coleman, 1982), and the higher the coordinator's position is placed in the hierarchy, the wider the range of activities that can be performed in the development and regulation of school resource center programs and services (Carter, 1971). The coordinator must be more involved in curriculum and public relations work, however.

The role of the principal is the key factor in the development of an effective school resource center program. The principal is the single most important player in the change process and plays a direct and active role in leading any process of change by becoming familiar with the nature of the change and by working with staff to develop, execute and monitor a school implementation plan (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1982; Fullan & Park, 1981). Principals are in the strongest position to conduct personal advocacy of innovations in the schools (Pratt, 1980)—through visible and clear support the principal can significantly affect the implementation and institutionalization of educational change (Gersten, Carnine & Green, 1989). The district needs to provide training and follow-up for principals to take responsibility for facilitating implementation in their schools (Fullan & Park, 1981).

Successful implementation requires principal support both substantively (by ensuring resources are available and schedules are accommodating) and psychologically (by encouraging teachers, acknowledging their concerns, providing personal time and assistance, rewarding their efforts, and communicating that the implementation is a school priority) (Cato, 1990; Cox, 1989; Fullan & Park, 1981; Hord & Huling-Austin, 1986; Loucks & Lieberman, 1983; Virgilio & Virgilio, 1984). Successful implementation requires that principals create the climate (collegiality, communication and trust) (Fullan et al., 1986) and the mechanisms (time and opportunity, interaction, technical sharing and assistance, and ongoing staff development) to support the implementation of innovation (Cox, 1989; Fullan, 1985; Fullan et al., 1986; Pratt, 1980). Even the attitude of the principal toward the role of the teacher-librarian affects the TL's involvement in curricular issues (Corr, 1979). Indeed, exemplary school resource centers are characterized by strong administrative support (Charter, 1982; Shields, 1977). Principals in schools with exemplary resource center programs integrate the resource center in instructional programs, encourage student and teacher use and provide flexible scheduling (Hellene, 1973).

Plans for effective staff development recognize that change is a gradual and difficult process (Guskey, 1986), provide sufficient time to produce demonstrable results (Hunter, 1986; Rubin, 1987) and demonstrate that the strategies will bring about short and long term benefits to students (Rubin, 1987). Short presentations can be invaluable as awareness sessions and in helping people to make decisions about those areas where extended workshops would be beneficial (Nevi, 1986) but they will not result in changed practice. The steps in effective staff development include the presentation of information or theory, modeling or demonstration of the change, an opportunity to practice, feedback (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1985; British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1989), and on-site assistance to staff in the form of technical assistance, coaching and/or peer support (Cawelti, 1989; Hunter, 1986; Kent, 1985; Rubin, 1987; Showers et al., 1987; Sparks & Bruder, 1987; Van Sant, 1988). This is particularly effective through a collegial support system that values growth activities, provides moral support and facilitates small group interaction (McGiffin, 1990; Paquette, 1987).

Building on the research in teacher-librarianship—through role clarification, cooperative program planning and teaching and flexible scheduling—and in curriculum implementation and staff development—through careful planning, effective leadership, credible in-service and coaching, with both pressure and support—teacher-librarians and other educators can implement the major changes required for TLs and resource centers to become effective agents for student achievement. Too often we believe so much in the value of our programs that we think that a "one-shot" workshop will change the way principals schedule, the way teachers teach and the way teacher-librarians plan with colleagues, and then we are disappointed when these changes do not occur. The implementation of a change as significant as cooperative program planning and teaching and flexible scheduling, however, requires the invol-vement of all the partners and systematic and ongoing training, pressure and support.

With successful programs in place, teacher-librarians can then assume more responsibility for writing about their role and

about collaboratively planned programs for professional journals read by teachers and administrators (Mack, 1957). This accepted means of communication is not being used to its fullest potential in communicating the contribution of teacher-librarians and school resource centers and the curricular role of the TL (Van Orden, 1970), and this can be done effectively only by TLs themselves (Holzberlein, 1971). It is critical that principals and teachers read about exciting approaches such as resource-based teaching and learning in the journals that they read since they are not going to read ours. The successes of cooperatively planned and taught units of study need to be celebrated not only in our publications but also in the publications of our teacher partners and in the publications of principal leaders.

For an information profession, we need only learn from our research and build on its precepts in order to become that force for excellence that is within our grasp. We have the evidence that we can make a difference through cooperative program planning and teaching and flexible scheduling; we have the principles for the effective initiation, implementation and institutionalization of change. Now we need only do it.

References

Adams, E. P. (1973). *An analysis of the relationship of certain personality factors to the amount of time allotted to specified public service tasks by selected school librarians*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.

Alexander, K. G. (1992). *Profiles of four exemplary elementary school media specialists*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Miami.

Bechtel, D. D. (1975). *Media specialist competency and inservice evaluation preferences in the junior high and middle schools of South Dakota*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota.

Becker, D. E. (1970). *Social studies achievement of pupils in schools with libraries and schools without libraries*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Bias, L. V. (1979). *The role and function of the media specialist as perceived by principals, teachers, and media specialists in elementary schools in Montgomery County, Maryland*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.

Bishop, K. (1992). *The roles of the school library media specialist in an elementary school using a literature-based reading program: An ethnographic case study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University.

British Columbia Ministry of Education. (1982). *Guidelines for planning program implementation*. Victoria, BC: Author.

British Columbia Ministry of Education. (1985). *Research update: Effective staff development*. Victoria, BC: Author.

British Columbia Ministry of Education. (1989a). *The principal as instructional leader: Facilitating Ministry of Education program changes* [Workshop booklet]. Victoria, BC: Author.

British Columbia Ministry of Education. (1989b). *School district planning of curriculum implementation*. Victoria, BC: Author.

Burcham, C. V. (1989). *The perceptions and beliefs of principals, teachers, and media specialists regarding the role of media specialists in the public schools of Georgia*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia.

Callison, H. L. 1979. *The impact of the school media specialist on curriculum design and implementation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina.

Carter, E. M. (1971). *The organizational structure for state school library supervision and the functions, duties, and activities of state school library supervisors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

Cato, J. (1990). "Principals: Key in school improvement." *Educational Leader*, 3(10), 1, 16.

Cawelti, G. (1989). "Designing high schools for the future." *Educational Leadership*, 17(1), 30-35.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Charter, J. B. (1982). *Case study profiles of six exemplary public high school library media programs*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University.

Coleman, J. G., Jr. (1982). *Perceptions of "guiding principles" in "Media programs: District and school."* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia.

Connors, M. (1984). *The superintendent's perception of the school library media center*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University.

Corr, G. P. (1979). *Factors that affect the school library media specialist's involvement in curriculum planning and implementation in small high schools in Oregon*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon.

Cox, P. L. (1989). "Complementary roles in successful change." In R. S. Brandt (Ed.), *Effective schools and school improvement: Readings from Educational Leadership* (pp. 131-134). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Daresh, J. C. (1987). "Staff development—guidelines for the principal." *NASSP Bulletin*, 71(497), 20-23.

Dow, I. I., Whitehead, R. Y. & Wright, R. L. (1984). *Curriculum implementation: A framework for action*. Toronto: Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation.

Dyer, E. R. (1976). *Cooperation in library services to children: A fifteen year forecast of alternatives using the Delphi technique*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University.

Ekechukwu, M. R. G. (1972). *Characteristics of users and nonusers of elementary school library services and public library services for children*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.

Elam, S. M., Cramer, J. & Brodinsky, B. (1986). *Staff development: problems and solutions*. Arlington: American Association of School Administrators.

Fullan, M. G. (1985). "Change processes and strategies at the local level." *The Elementary School Journal*, 85(3), 391-420.

Fullan, M. G., Anderson, S. & Newton, E. (1986). *Support systems for implementing curriculum in school boards*. Toronto: OISE Press and Ontario Government Bookstore.

Fullan, M. G. & Park, P. (1981). *Curriculum implementation: A resource booklet*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Fullan, M. G. & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Gersten, R., Carnine, D. & Green, S. (1989). "The principal as instructional leader: A second look." In R. S. Brandt (Ed.), *Effective schools and school improvement: Readings from Educational Leadership* (pp. 127-130). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Greve, C. L. (1974). *The relationship between the availability of libraries to the academic achievement of Iowa high school seniors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Denver.

Griffin, G. A. (1987). "The school in society and social organization of the school." In M. F. Wideen & I. Andrews (Eds.), *Staff development for school improvement* (pp. 16-37). Philadelphia: Falmer.

Guskey, T. R. (1986). "Staff development and the process of teacher change." *Educational Researcher*, 15(5), 5-12.

Hambleton, A. E. L. (1980). *The elementary school librarian in Ontario: A study of role perception, role conflict and effectiveness*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.

Hartley, N. B. T. (1980). *Faculty utilization of the high school library*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University.

Haycock, K. (1992). *What works: Research about teaching and learning through the school's library resource center*. Seattle, WA/Vancouver, BC: Rockland Press.

Hellene, D. L. I. (1973). *The relationships of the behaviors of principals in the state of Washington to the development of school library media programs*. Unpublished doc-toral dissertation, University of Wash-ington.

Hodson, Y. D. (1978). *Values and functions of the school media center as perceived by fourth and sixth grade students and their teachers in compared school settings*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Holzberlein, D. B. (1971). *The contribution of school media programs to elementary and secondary education as portrayed in professional journals available to school administrators from 1960 to 1969*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.

Hord, S. M. & Huling-Austn, L. (1986). "Effective curriculum implementation: Some promising new insights." *Elementary School Journal*, 87(1), 97-115.

Howey, K. R. & Vaughan, J. C. (1983)." Current patterns of staff development." In G. A. Griffin (Ed.), *Staff development (82nd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education,* pp. 92-117). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hunter, S. M. (1986). *The school makes the difference: What the research says about—staff development* (Bulletin Number 5). Vancouver, BC: Vancouver School Board.

Johnson, H. R. (1975). *Teacher utilization of libraries in the secondary schools of Tucson District No. 1*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona.

Jones, C. A. (1977). *The Georgia public school library media program, 1965-1975*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia.

Kelley, I. G. (1992). *Cooperation between public libraries and public school library/media centers in Massachusetts*. Unpublished doctoral disser-tation, Boston University.

Kent, K. (1985). "A successful program of teachers assisting teachers." *Educational Leadership,* 43(3), 30-33.

Kerr, S. T. (1975). *The diffusion and implementation of an instructional-developmental function for learning resources specialists in public schools: A study in role consensus*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.

Kim, J. S. (1981). *The role of the library media specialist in curriculum development and instructional design*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University.

Krashen, S. (1993). *The power of reading: Insights from the research*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Lance, K. C., Welborn, L. & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (1993). *The impact of school library media centers on academic achievement*. Castle Rock, CO: Hi Willow Research and Publishing.

Lee, L. E. & Wong, K. (1985). *Curriculum implementation: Results, issues, and strategies* (Research report 84-03a). Winnipeg, MB: Manitoba Education, Planning and Research Branch.

Loucks, S. F. & Lieberman, A. (1983). "Curriculum implementation." In F. W. English (Ed.), *Fundamental curriculum decisions* (pp. 126-141). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lowden, E. G. (1980). *Level of sophistication of instructional media/learning resource center programs in area vocational-technical schools in the state of Oklahoma as perceived by superintendents and instructors as compared to their preferences for these programs*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University.

Lowe, J. L. (1984). *A comparative analysis of reading habits and abilities of students in selected elementary schools in North Louisiana with and without centralized libraries*. Unpub-lished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University.

Mack, E. B. (1957). *The school library's contribution to the total educational program of the school: A content analysis of*

selected periodicals in the field of education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.

Madaus, J. R. (1974). *Curriculum involvement: Teacher structures, and personality factors of librarians in school media programs*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas.

Markle, A. B. (1982). *Defining the roles of library/media personnel in a large school district*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University.

McAfee, D. T. (1981). *A study to determine the presence of observable conditions of positive self-concept in elementary school media centers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin—Madison.

McGiffin, P. A. (1990). *The school library media specialist as a resource person: A descriptive study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts.

McMillen, R. D. (1965). An analysis of library programs and a determination of educational justification of these programs in selected elementary schools of Ohio. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Reserve University.

Mooradian, E. D. (1985). Curriculum planning in a selected school district that lacks curriculum staff workers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Nevi, C. (1986). Against the grain: Half truths that hinder staff development. Principal, 65(3), 44-46.

Nolan, J. P. (1989). A comparison of two methods of instruction in library research skills for elementary school students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.

Olson, L. E. (1966). Teachers', principals', and librarians' perceptions of the school librarian's role. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Orlich, D. C. (1989). Staff development: Enhancing human potential. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Ornstein, A. C. & Hunkins, F. P. (1988). Implementing curriculum changes: Guidelines for principals. NASSP Bulletin, 72(511), 67-72.

Pichette, W. H. (1975). The role of the IMC director in two types of elementary school organizational structures. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Paquette, M. (1987). Voluntary collegial support groups for teachers. Educational Leadership, 45(3), 36-39.

Payne, D. L. (1967). The superintendent's perception of selected library practices in the public schools of the state of Mississippi. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi.

Pratt, D. (1980). Curriculum: Design and development. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich.

Romberg, T. A. & Price, G. G. (1983). Curriculum implementation and staff development as cultural change. In G. A. Griffin (Ed.), Staff development (82nd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, pp. 154-184). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Royal, S. W. (1981). An investigation of the relationships between the educational level of school library media personnel and perceived competencies needed to develop instructional activities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University.

Rubin, L. (1987). Curriculum and staff development. In M. F. Wideen & I. Andrews (Eds.), Staff development for school improvement (pp. 172-181). Philadelphia: Falmer.

Scott, M. S. (1982). School library media center programs: Student perceptions as criteria for library media program funding. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.

Shields, D. M. (1977). A fault tree approach to analyzing school library media services. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University.

Showers, B., Joyce, B. & Bennett, B. (1987).

Synthesis of research on staff development: A framework for future study and a state-of-the-art analysis. Educational Leadership, 45(3), 77-87.

Smith, J. B. (1978). An exploratory study of the effectiveness of an innovative process designed to integrate library skills into the curriculum. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University.

Sparks, G. M. & Bruder, S. (1987). Before and after peer coaching. *Educational Leadership*, 45(3), 54-57.

Stanwich, E. E. (1982). School library media specialist's involvement in curriculum planning. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Sullivan, J. S. (1977). The role of the elementary school media director as viewed by media center directors and principals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University.

Van Dreser, R. J. (1971). A survey related to job competencies of the instructional media specialist. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska.

Van Orden, P. J. (1970). Use of media and the media center, as reflected in professional journals for elementary school teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University.

Van Sant, R. (1988). Staff development in the 1980s. Wingspan, 4(1), 11-13.

Virgilio, S. J. & Virgilio, I. R. (1984) The role of the principal in curriculum implementation. Education, 104(4), 346-350.

Wilson, L. W. (1972). The role of the media specialist as perceived by public elementary school media specialists and principals in North Carolina. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Washington University.

Woolls, E. B. S. (1973). Cooperative library services to children in public libraries and public school systems in selected communities in Indiana. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1973.

Yarling, J. R. (1968). Children's understandings and use of selected library-related skills in two elementary schools, one with and one without a centralized library. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ball State University.